arXiv:gr-qc/9702030v1 17 Feb 1997

The future of spin networks

Lee Smolin*

Center for Gravitational Physics and Geometry
Department of Physics
The Pennsylvania State University
University Park, PA, USA 16802

January 26, 1997

ABSTRACT

Since Roger Penrose first introduced the notion of a spin network as a simple model of discrete quantum geometry, they have reappeared in quantum gauge theories, quantum gravity, topological quantum field theory and conformal field theory. The roles that spin networks play in these contexts are briefly described, with an emphasis on the question of the relationships among them. It is also argued that spin networks and their generalizations provide a language which may lead to a unification of the different approaches to quantum gravity and quantum geometry. This leads to a set of conjectures about the form of a future theory that may be simultaneously an extension of the non-perturbative quantization of general relativity and a non-perturbative formulation of string theory.

* smolin@phys.psu.edu

"A reformulation is suggested in which quantities normally requiring continuous coordinates for their description are eliminated from primary consideration. In particular, since space and time have therefore to be eliminated, what might be called a form of Mach's principle must be invoked: a relationship of an object to some background space should not be considered-only the relationships of objects to each other can have significance."

-Roger Penrose, *Theory of quantized directions*[1]

1 Introduction

Among the many ideas that Roger Penrose has contributed to our growing understanding of space and time, none is so characteristic as one of his first, which was spin networks[1, 2]. Originally invented as a simple model of a discrete quantum geometry, spin networks have become much more than that. They have been found to provide the kinematical structure of quantum general relativity[3, 4]. Moreover, they play key roles in lattice gauge theory[5, 6] and natural generalizations of them, called *quantum spin networks*[7], play an important role in topological field theory and conformal field theory[8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 13], as well as in quantum gravity with a cosmological constant[15, 16]. The best tribute I could think of, then, to the contribution of Roger Penrose, is to give a quick survey of the role that spin networks have played in these different developments in quantum gravity and mathematics. Moreover, this gives me an opportunity, not only to talk about the role spin networks have played up till now, but to offer some conjectures about about how spin networks might play a key role in bringing together the most promising developments in quantum gravity of the last decade, concerned with string theory, non-perturbative quantum gravity, topological quantum field theory and black hole thermodynamics.

I hope the reader will not mind if I tell this story from a personal point of view. There seems no better way to explain the influence that Roger's ideas have had on those of us who have been trying to follow his path to an understanding of the ground on which space, time and the quantum are one.

2 Penrose's spin networks

The motivation behind spin networks is described well in the quote above, which comes from an unpublished manuscript written at the Battelle Institute[1].

According to that paper, one wants a description of quantum geometry that is at the same time:

- Discrete, built purely from combinatorial structures, and
- purely relational, so that it makes reference to no background notions of space, time or geometry[1].

The goal of Penrose's construction was to realize a simple model of such a system. What he posited is a system consisting of a number of "units", each of which has a total angular momentum. They interact, in ways that conserve total angular momentum. Without a background geometry, a particle can only have a total angular momentum, as there is nothing with respect to which a direction in space may be defined.

The system is then described by an arbitrary trivalent graph, Γ, whose edges are labeled by integers, corresponding to twice the total angular momentum. The nodes describe interactions at which the units meet. The only condition imposed is that at the nodes the conservation of angular momentum must be satisfied. As there is as yet neither a concept of space or time, it is left undefined whether the graph is supposed to correspond to the state or the history of the system[2].

The spin networks that correspond to the states (or histories) are networks, Γ, with open ends. The corresponding states may be denoted $|\Gamma>$. To take the norm of such a state, one takes it and its mirror image, and ties up each pair of corresponding open ends, forming a closed spin network, called $\Gamma\#\tilde{\Gamma}$. There is then a number which may be assigned to any closed spin network, which is called its value, V. The norm is then given by

$$<\Gamma|\Gamma>= V[\Gamma\#\tilde{\Gamma}] \tag{1}$$

This is the entire theory. The idea is that everything else about the system must be deducible from combinatorial principles from the graph that describes the system, in particular any quantum probabilities that the theory predicts must be deduced from this norm 1.

Penrose defines the value $V[\Delta]$ of a closed spin network Δ as follows. Each edge with label j is decomposed into j lines. At each node one then has a number of curves that must be joined, coming from the edges that come into it. By conservation of angular momentum it is possible to connect up

[1] The roots of this are of course Leibniz's relational philosophy of space and time.

[2] Of course, this is not so different from the situation in quantum cosmology.

all the lines coming into the nodes, without joining any two that come from the same edge. In general there will be a number of ways to do this at each node. Each such choice results in a number, N, of closed loops. The value $V[\Delta]$ is then defined by the sum,

$$V[\Delta] = \prod_{edges} \frac{1}{j!} \sum_{routings} \epsilon(-2)^N \tag{2}$$

where ϵ is a sign which is defined such that two routings that differ by a crossing of lines in any edge have the opposite sign.

One consequence of this definition is that the value is invariant under all the identities of the theory of recoupling of angular momentum. Those identities correspond to certain graphical relationships among networks, which may be used to define objects such as $6j$ symbols completely combinatorially. In practice one uses these identities to reduce a spin network evaluation to combinations of $6j$ symbols, which is easier and much less prone to error than trying to keep track of all the signs and factors in 2.

The main result of the theory is that the space of directions in space can be recovered from a notion of probability based on the value, in the limit of large spin networks[1, 2]. One defines a situation in which the angle between two edges emerging from a complicated network may be measured. I will not give the details here, but the point is that the quantum mechanical probabilities as a function of an angle, between the units defined by the two edges is recovered, in the limit that the spins of the edges are large and the network is also large.

I will not go into more detail about Penrose's formulation of spin networks, which is explained in several places[1, 2, 4]. Instead, I close this section by mentioning two easy generalizations of the concept.

The first generalization is that we can include also graphs with nodes of any valence. In this case, there are additional labels associated with the nodes. To see why, note that a trivalent node can be understood as corresponding to a map from the representations of $SU(2)$ given by the labels on the edges incident on it to the identity representation. For the case of three representations, that map, when it exists, is unique. But there may be more than one invariant map from a product of four or more representations to the identity representation. Each such map is called an intertwiner. For each choice of representations $j_1, ..., j_N$ there is a finite dimensional linear space of such intertwiners, called $\mathcal{V}_{j_1,...,j_N}$. Each such higher valent node

must then be labeled by a state from the corresponding space[3].

We thus see that the structure of spin networks is based on the representation theory of $SU(2)$. This leads to the second easy generalization, which is to base the formalism on the representation theory of any Lie Group G. In this case a spin network is a graph Γ, whose edges are labeled by representations, r of G, while its nodes are labeled by the corresponding intertwiners[17].

In fact, the concept of spin networks can be defined beyond the representation theory of Lie groups. The reason is that the main thing we are using from representation theory is that there is an algebraic structure defined on the representations of a Lie group, such that the product of any two can be decomposed into a sum of such representations. In fact, there are algebras whose representation theory has this property, which are not Lie groups. These more general objects are Hopf algebras and their representation theory may be described in terms of the theory of monoidal categories[18, 19, 20, 21][4]. Thus, there is a still more general class of spin networks associated with these objects[7, 18, 19, 20, 21]. I will describe these a bit later.

3 Spin networks in lattice gauge theory

Roger Penrose went on to invent twistor theory, the singularity theorems and many other things and his spinnets remained a kind of talisman for people who believed in the possibility that space and time, or at least space, has an underlying discrete structure. But after a bit more than a decade they began reemerge, first in one context, then another. The first place they cropped up is lattice gauge theory, which is also the best place to begin to explain the role they play in quantum gravity.

Here is a too brief survey of lattice gauge theory[5]. One has a graph, Λ, which is usually taken to be a regular cubic lattice of dimension d. However, as it costs nothing to describe the general case, let us allow Λ to be completely general. The graph has nodes n_i and directed edges e_{ij}, which connect node n_i to node n_j. (Not every two nodes are connected, but this notation is still the most convenient. The only awkwardness is if two nodes n_i and n_j are joined by two or more edges, they may then be denoted

[3]One way to give a basis for the space of intertwiners is to give a decomposition of the higher valent node in terms of a trivalent network[4].

[4]The precise definitions depend on exactly which properties are assumed.

$e_{ij,1}, e_{ij,2}$,etc.) One picks a compact Lie group, G. A configuration of the theory then consists of a choice of an element $g_{ij} \in G$ for each directed edge e_{ij} of Λ. There is one restriction, which is that $g_{ji} = g_{ij}^{-1}$ which is where we use the directness of the graph.

There are two cases of interest. If we are interested in a path integral formulation in d dimensional spacetime than the configurations are histories. If we are interested in a Hamiltonian formulation then the collection of all configurations is the configuration space. In either case I will denote it $\mathcal{C} = \prod_{ij} G$. That is, the configuration space consists of one copy of the group G for each edge of the lattice. I will denote a particular configuration just as g_{ij}.

Actually this is not the physical configuration space. What makes the theory interesting is that there is a gauge invariance which is defined as follows. A gauge transformation consists of a choice of an element h_i for each site of the graph. A gauge transformation is then the map

$$g_{ij} \to g'_{ij} = h_i^{-1} g_{ij} h_j \tag{3}$$

The space of all gauge transformations forms a group under the natural definition in which products of elements are taken at each site. This group is called $\mathcal{G}$. The basic postulate of the theory is that all physically meaningful quantities are invariant under this transformation. This means that the physical configuration space is $\mathcal{C}_{gauge} = \mathcal{C}/\mathcal{G}$.

From now on in this section I will restrict attention to the Hamiltonian form of the theory. In the quantum theory states will be functions Ψ on $\mathcal{C}_{gauge}$. To make the quantum theory we need an inner product on $\mathcal{C}_{gauge}$. There is a natural inner product on functions of $\mathcal{C}$ which is given by

$$< \Psi | \Phi >= \prod_{ij} \int d\mu(g_{ij}) \bar{\Psi}(g_{ij}) \Phi(g_{ij}) \tag{4}$$

where $d\mu(g_{ij})$ is the Haar measure of the group. It is interesting to note that this inner product works for the gauge invariant states as well. The reason is that as the integral over the gauge groups is finite for compact groups, one can show that on gauge invariant states 4 gives an inner product.

What does all of this have to do with spin networks? A great deal, for they provide a very useful orthonormal basis of physical states. To see why, we introduce first the overcomplete set of states based on loops. A curve γ in the graph Λ is a list of edges $e_{i_\alpha j_\alpha} = e_\alpha$ such that the each begins on the

node the previous one ends on. A loop is a closed curve. Associated with each loop $\gamma = e_1 \cdot e_2 \cdot ...e_N$ with N edges we may define the Wilson loop as

$$T[\gamma] = Tr[\prod_{\alpha} U(g_\alpha)] \tag{5}$$

where the $U(g_\alpha)$ are matrices in the fundamental representation of G.

The space of all $T[\gamma]$ forms an overcomplete basis of $\mathcal{C}_{gauge}$. The basis is overcomplete because of relationships between traces of products of matrices, which are called the Mandelstam identities (See for example, [22, 23, 4]. However a complete basis of linearly independent states exists and is given by the spinnets. A spinnet Γ on a graph Λ is given by a set of curves and intertwiners. The curves, β_I, each have unique support, which means that no two curves in the set β_I share a common edge. The curves then meet at a set of nodes n_X, which are a subset of the nodes in Λ. The curves are each labeled by a choice of an irreducible representation r_I. The nodes at which they meet are labeled by the intertwiners. If a node n_X has incident on it a set of curves, β_A then the intertwiner s_X is a choice of invariant map from $\otimes_A r_A$ to the trivial representation.

Given a spinnet Γ one can construct a gauge invariant state. It is easier to say how than to write it. On each curve, labeled by r take the products of the matrices of the group elements in that representation. Then, at each node, multiply by the intertwiner that takes those representations incident on it to the identity. The result is a gauge invariant functional of the group elements g_{ij} and hence an element of $\mathcal{C}_{gauge}$. We may denote it $|\Gamma>$. To show that these states are complete and independent is also straightforward, given the inner product 4.

Note that these spin network states do not satisfy the set of identities that come from recoupling theory, which is the case of the original networks of Penrose. The reason is that the states $|\Gamma>$ are not purely combinatorial objects, they are functions of the configuration g_{ij}.

For the simple case of $SU(2)$ it is straightforward to expand Γ as a product of Wilson loops. One just writes the representation matrices in the r'th representations as symmetric products of the fundamental representation matrices ${U(g)_A}^B$, where $A, B = 0, 1$. Thus, for example, the spin 3/2 representation matrix may be written

$${U(g)_{ABC}}^{DEF} = {U(g)_A}^{(D} {U(g)_B}^E {U(g)_C}^{F)} \tag{6}$$

The intertwiners are then made out of the appropriate combinations of

$\epsilon^{AB}, \epsilon_{AB}$ and δ^A_B. There is a beautiful graphical notation for all this, but it is explained well in a number of places, so I will not describe it here.

The fact that the spin nets provide this basis is not new, it was mentioned in the first paper on Hamiltonian lattice gauge theory[5] and exploited in a number of later papers in lattice gauge theory. (See, for example [6].) Of course, the lattice gauge theory papers do not use the word "spin network" in this context. In fact, it was not until much later that the coincidence of the occurrence of the same structure in gauge theory and speculations about discrete structure of spacetime was exploited, although it was certainly known to a number of people.

4 Spin networks in non-perturbative quantum gravity

The story of how spin networks entered quantum gravity is a tale that illustrates the unity and interconnections that have existed beneath the surface of contemporary theoretical physics, despite the unfortunate divisions into subfields and camps. As Roger has been involved in more than one of the strands of the story, this is a story both about his influence and the universality of some of the central ideas that have formed our understanding of gauge fields and gravity.

The first strand follows Roger's work from spin networks to twistor theory. There he discovered a very curious fact[5], which is the importance of self-duality for an understanding of the dynamics of the gravitational field. For in spite of the fact that the Einstein's equations are duality invariant, the restriction to either the self-dual or anti-selfdual sector leads to an exactly solvable system, whose solutions can be described completely in terms of consistency conditions for the existence of certain complex manifolds. The simplification of field equations to the self-dual sector is equally profound and important for Yang-Mills theory, and indeed the self-dual or instanton solutions play an essential role now in both mathematics and physics. By another basic and profound fact all this is related to another of the strands of Roger's work, which is the expression of general relativity in terms of spinors. This is because the duality transformation in four spacetime dimensions induces chiral transformations that takes left handed spinors into right handed.

[5] also noticed and exploited by Ted Newman and Jerzy Plebanski.

All of this suggested that the dynamics of general relativity itself might be simplified were it to be expressed in terms of chiral variables. The first concrete realization of this emerged in two crucial papers of Amitaba Sen[24], in which he found that the constraints of the Hamiltonian formulation of general relativity took very simple polynomial forms when expressed in terms of the self-dual (or left-handed) parts of the connection and curvature. A number of us puzzled over that paper, but it took Abhay Ashtekar to realize the full import of what it implied, which was in fact the possibility of a hamiltonian formalism for general relativity[25] in which the configuration variable was exactly the self-dual part of the spacetime connection, A_a^{AB}, while the momentum variable is the frame field $\tilde{E}^a_{AB}$. In this formalism the constraints take the polynomial forms found by Sen; this then became the basis for much of the revival of work in quantum gravity.

Not surprisingly, this led directly to a new understanding of the self-dual sector. The already simple formulas of the canonical theory simplified still further when one restricted to the self-dual sector by setting F_{ab}^{AB}, the curvature of A_a^{AB}, to zero, as was discovered by Ted Jacobson and developed in [26] and [27].

The Ashtekar formalism is sometimes seen to be primarily a development of the Hamiltonian theory, but it led immediately to a reformulation of the lagrangian approach as well. Indeed, it led to more than one, as the first action principle in terms of self-dual variables[28] led to the way to the discovery of formulations in which the metric does not even appear[29].

Of course, the Ashtekar formalism had profound implications for quantum gravity, but to trace these we must return to lattice gauge theory. One of the inventors of lattice gauge theory was Polyakov, who then went on to try to express QCD in terms of loop variables in the continuum[30]. One of the strongest memories I have from graduate school is a seminar given by Sasha Polyakov that he began by announcing his hope to solve QCD exactly by expressing it purely as a theory of loops. A different approach to this idea was also developed by Migdal and Makenko[31]. While Polyakov's hope has not so far been realized, these papers were the inspiration for a number of developments, no less in quantum gravity than in other areas.

Among these was an attempt to model quantum general relativity as a lattice gauge theory[32], in which the spacetime connection played the role of the gauge field. The idea of this early lattice formulation of quantum gravity was to explore non-perturbative approaches to quantum gravity. It was particularly motivated by conjectures of Wilson[33], Parisi[34] and Weinberg[35] that perturbatively non-renormalizable theories might in

fact exist were there to be non-trivial fixed points of their renormalization groups[6].

These were good ideas, but at the time they led nowhere. In fact during the early 80's most of us working in quantum gravity were wasting our time (or at least spending it poorly, considering what we might have been doing) with various perturbative formulations. My own return to non-perturbative quantum gravity came with work with Louis Crane, most of it never published, in which we tried to develop a background independent form of string theory based on loops variables, which were dual to either the spacetime metric or connection. This work was inspired primarily by the papers of Polyakov and Migdal and Makenko. It was also motivated by work Crane and I had done on quantum gravity on fractal spacetimes, in which we understood that quantum general relativity might exist if non-perturbative effects lowered the apparent dimensionality of spacetime, as seen by the scaling behavior of propagators above the Planck scalell-fractal. As a result, we were looking for a way to describe a non-smooth structure for quantum geometry, in which the effective dimension of space at Planck scales would appear to be less than three, in terms of loops.

As soon as the Ashtekar formalism appeared, it was clear this was the way to realize these ideas. The thing to do was to construct some kind of discrete geometry from Wilson loops made from the Sen-Ashtekar connection. First, with Paul Renteln, we made a lattice formalism[38]. This has one big disadvantage, which is that it is impossible to realize diffeomorphism invariant states on it[39], but as a tool for understanding both the state space and the action of the hamiltonian, it has been used to good effect since, most of all by Ezawa[40], Loll[41] and Gambini and Pullin[42]. Then with Ted Jacobson we began investigating a continuum formalism. There we had a wonderful surprise, which is the discovery of an infinite class of physical states-exact solutions to the Hamiltonian constraints[43]. Moreover, even more than this, we found that the Hamiltonian constraint acts in a simple way on states made from Wilson loops, with an action that is concentrated at points of intersections of the loops.

One key question we faced in this work with Jacobson was what was the actual space of states of the theory. It was clear that the states on which the Hamiltonian constraint had a simple action were not Fock states. This was good as Fock states depend on a background metric, which doesn't exist in a non-perturbative formalism. Even if we could make sense of it, the

[6]For an attempt to realize this in quantum gravity, see [36].

background metric would interfere with the action of the diffeomorphisms of space, which are supposed to be the gauge group, just as much as a lattice does. On the other hand, what was the alternative? We knew we didn't want to use a lattice regularization, and we weren't aware of any other choice besides the lattice regularization or Fock space to define the space of states of a quantum field theory. Something new was needed. To invent it, we were guided by simple physical ideas. First, was the physical picture going back to Penrose and spin networks, that at the Planck scale the structure of space and time should be discrete. This picture had been reinforced by the renormalization group point of view, which suggested that to realize the conjecture that the theory is defined through a non-trivial fixed point, it was necessary that quantum geometry be based on sets of lower dimensionality below the Planck scale.

Second, we took over the relationship between quantization of nonabelian electric flux and Wilson loops coming from QCD. This picture comes from ideas of Holgar Nielson and others, who had taught us to think of the vacuum of QCD as something like a dual superconductor[44]. In a superconductor the magnetic flux is quantized, so the flux through any surface comes only in integer units of a quantum of flux. In confinement we know that the non-abelian electric flux forms tubes whose energy is proportional to their length, which is also the case for the quantized magnetic flux lines in a superconductor. It is then natural to think that in the vacuum the non-abelian electric flux is quantized.

Taken together these ideas suggested that a discrete quantum geometry might be something like an idealized form of the QCD vacuum, but without any background structure, so that the flux associated with the spacetime connection would be quantized. To realize this picture, we thought about working, not with a Fock space, but with a space of states spanned by a basis, each of which was made of finite products of Wilson loops. Thus, we considered the kinematical state space space $\mathcal{H}_{kinematical}$ spanned by the overcomplete basis,

$$\Psi_{\gamma_i}[A] = \prod_i T[\gamma, A] \tag{7}$$

where γ_i is any finite set of loops and $T[\gamma, A] = TrPe^{\int_\gamma A}$ is the Wilson loop, or traced holonomy.

States of the form 7 are exactly those in which the non-abelian electric field flux is quantized. That is, if we identify the operator for non-abelian

electric flux through a surface S as $E(S)$, then we have

$$\hat{E}(S)\Psi_\gamma(A) = Int[\gamma, S]^2\Psi_\gamma(A) \tag{8}$$

in the case that there are only simple intersections of the loop and the surface, i.e. the loop does not intersect itself at the surface. (Here $Int[\gamma, S]$ is the intersection number of the loop and the surface.)

It was thus natural to think that the discrete states 7 represent a discrete geometry. Furthermore, it was obvious immediately that if the diffeomorphism constraint could be solved on this space of states, the resulting set of states would be labeled by diffeomorphism classes of loops, which is to say knots, links and, most generally, networks[45]. Thus, knot theory immediately emerged as being important for understanding the state space of quantum gravity!

These ideas were later formalized by people more mathematical than ourselves, in the language of rigorous quantum field theory[46, 47, 17][7]. But I think it is important to emphasize that the roots of these constructions were in these simple physical ideas, which came from QCD, renormalization group arguments, and speculations about the Planck scale.

In fact, it took several years to realize the whole picture. For one thing one had to give a good definition of the operator $\hat{E}(S)$. Formally it looks like,

$$\hat{E}(S) = \int_S \sqrt{\tilde{E}^a_i \tilde{E}^b_i n_a n_b} \tag{9}$$

where n_a is the unit normal of S. The problem is how to define the operator product and square root. To do this one needs a regularization procedure, and all known regularization procedures depend on a background metric. The question is then whether one can define it through a regularization procedure such that diffeomorphism invariance is not broken, and the operator takes diffeomorphism invariant states to diffeomorphism invariant states. It took some time before a way to do this was found[23]. By this time I had realized that the non-abelian electric field flux 9 was none other than the area of the surface S[23]. Thus, in quantum gravity, discreteness of area corresponds exactly to confinement in QCD[8].

[7] For a review of the present state of the mathematical development of these ideas, see [48]. For a demonstration of the equivalence of the formulation of Ashtekar, Lewandowski, Marlof, Mourãu and Thiemann with the earlier formulation of [22, 23, 4, 3], see [49].

[8] It is very interesting to speculate whether the correct way to formulate QCD rigorously should not be in terms of the discrete measure [47] which formalizes the notion of a discrete

Finally, if one puts in all the constants, the Wilson loop of the Sen-Ashtekar connection is actually

$$T[\gamma, A] = e^{G\int_\gamma A} \tag{10}$$

where G is Newton's constant. Thus, the quanta of area is proportional to $\hbar G = l^2_{Planck}$.

The second thing was to construct the diffeomorphism invariant states which required the loop representation. The idea to do this by changing to a representation in which the states were functions of loops was due to Carlo Rovelli; once we had the idea it did not take long to work it out[22][9].

Another important operator is the volume of a region of space $V[R]$. It was immediately clear from formal expressions that if it could be defined it would be discrete like area and the discrete eigenvalue would count something happening at points where three or more loops meet. This took a long time to work out[23], and it was this problem that led to the introduction of spin networks in quantum gravity. Of course, the reason spin networks come in is the same as in lattice gauge theory, because they give an independent basis for the states of the form 7. The construction of these states is the same as in the lattice case, one just takes any curve in space rather than just the curves on the lattice. Of course, this was known, and even mentioned at times[23], but it was not exploited. The main reason was that, unfortunately, the discovery of physical states associated with non-intersecting loops [43, 22]had pushed the question of what happened at the intersections into the background-even though it was clear- and emphasized by several people[10], that the actions of important operators including volume, the extrinsic curvature and the hamiltonian constraint were concentrated at the intersections.

In fact Roger had a lot to do with the realization that spin networks are important for quantum gravity. I was at a workshop in Cambridge trying to

state space given in [43]. The problem is that, before the diffeomorphism invariance is moded out, the space of states is non-seperable. This corresponds to an unphysical situation in which any displacement at all of a loop results in an orthogonal state; as a result the theory has too many degrees of freedom. On the other hand, QCD, like quantum gravity, clearly cannot be constructed from Fock space. One interesting conjecture to consider is then that QCD cannot be defined rigorously without coupling it to quantum gravity, so that diffeomorphism invariance reduces the space of spin network states to a countable basis.

[9]The loop representation had already been invented for QCD by Gambini and Trias[50], a lot of time could have been saved had we been aware of it.

[10]Especially Berndt Bruegmann and Jorge Pullin.

define and diagonalize the volume operator, and at some point realized that maybe the diagrammatic techniques Roger had developed to calculate with spin networks could help. I went to him and he showed me some tricks, which I used to find that the trivalent spin networks were eigenstates of the volume operator. With Carlo Rovelli we then worked out the action of all the operators we had on spin network states and found that these were even simpler than in terms of loops. Unfortunately, in the case of volume we got the eigenvalues wrong-they are zero for all the trivalent networks, as was pointed out later by Renata Loll[51][11]. In any case, we had finally realized that the central kinematical concept in quantum gravity is that the space of diffeomorphism invariant states is spanned by a basis in one to one correspondence with embeddings of spin networks[12].

The transformation to the loop representation can be done directly in the spin network basis[4]. When one mods out by spatial diffeomorphisms one is left with a state space $\mathcal{H}_{diffeo}$ which has an independent basis in one to one correspondence with diffeomorphism classes of imbeddings of spin-networks[13], which may be labeled $|\{\Gamma\}>$. Once we had this space it was immediate that there is a space of exact solutions, given by those spin networks without nodes. There are other sets of exact solutions, which include intersections, some of which have been known for a long time[43, 52], others of which were found recently by Thiemann[53, 54]. Thus, it seemed that Polyakov's dream that reducing a theory to loops leads to its exact solutions, is to some extent realized in quantum gravity.

Is the expression of quantum gravity in terms of spin networks an important idea, or just a technical convenience? I believe it is fundamental, probably even more fundamental than the idea that the states come from applying a quantization procedure to the infinite dimensional space of connections modulo gauge transformations. There are at least four reasons to believe this. First, we have arrived at a kinematics for quantum gravity that is discrete and combinatorial, and it seems likely that such structures are fundamental, while continuum concepts such as connections are artifacts of the myth that space is continuous. In fact, at the level of spatially diffeomorphism invariant states the connections have completely disappeared. There is only a space of states spanned by a basis $|\Gamma>$, where Γ now stands for

[11] And also realized independently by Georgio Imirzi and Michael Reisenberger.

[12] There have been many calculations of the spectra of volume, area and length. See, for example [16, 55, 56, 57, 58, 41, 59, 60, 61].

[13] Note that even though we have gotten rid of the dependence on connections, the states still are not equivalent under the recoupling identities of ordinary spin networks.

a diffeomorphism class of spin networks. The space of states has a natural inner product

$$< \Gamma | \Gamma' >= \delta_{\Gamma\Gamma'} \tag{11}$$

At this level all operators are combinatorial and topological, there is no role for a continuum concept such as a connection.

Second, the diffeomorphism classes of spin networks are somewhat more complicated than the corresponding combinatorial and topological classes. While it might seem at first that the diffeomorphism equivalence classes of networks imbedded in a spatial manifold are labeled only by their topology and connectivity, when the nodes have sufficiently high valence this is actually not the case. In the case of three dimensions, nodes with five or more incident edges require continuous parameters to label their diffeomorphism classes[62]. If one really believes that the theory is derived from a classical theory in the continuum all these should be included. But if, on the other hand, one believes that the fundamental structures are discrete, and the continuum is only an approximation, one might like to consider as meaningful only those labels of spin networks which are combinatorial or topological. Of course, the classes labeled by continuous parameters might be needed if any physically meaningful operator was known that measured those parameters, but so far none is known. Moreover, even if such an observable existed, it is likely it could be expressed as well as a slightly less local operator without the continuous parameters. For these reasons it seems best to consider the theory defined by spin networks defined only up to combinatorics and topology[14].

Third, there are difficulties if we take too seriously the idea that the description of states and operators in terms of spin networks is in fact the result of a derivation from the continuum theory. Some of these have to do with difficulties of the diffeomorphism regularization procedures that have, so far, been developed [23, 22, 3, 64, 56, 65, 59, 60, 53]. In all of the proposals so far made, a background metric is introduced which is used to parameterize a family of point split operators. The problem is to define a diffeomorphism invariant operator, which must have no dependence on the background metric, in the limit that the regulator is removed, bringing the operators together.

[14] A related argument has been raised[63] concerning even some of the topological information, that concerned with the embedding of the network in the spatial manifold. If the discrete structure is really prior to the manifold, then perhaps imbedding information ought not to play a role in the fundamental theory.

There is a very nice thing about these constructions, which is that when they succeed in constructing a diffeomorphism invariant operator, that operator is necessarily finite[23]. The reason is that any divergence, if present, is measured in units of the background metric. If the result of taking the limit in which the regulator is removed is an operator that does not depend on the background metric it cannot be proportional to any divergent quantity; it must then be finite. In fact, all cases that have been worked out go exactly like this, and this may be counted as one of the successes of non-perturbative quantum gravity: diffeomorphism invariance is sufficient to guarantee finiteness of operator products, defined through such a regularization procedures.

While this works simply for the case of the area operator, two kinds of problems appear when it is applied to more complicated cases including the volume, hamiltonian constraint and hamiltonians[15]. The first is ambiguity; different regularization procedures result in different diffeomorphism invariant operators. This is of course nothing new, it afflicts all quantum field theories. The second problem is more serious, it is that in these cases one must use highly non-trivial operator orderings in order to achieve a diffeomorphism invariant operator. For instance, in the loop or spin network representation the limit is taken along families of operators that measure various features of the loops at intersections, beyond that information which is gathered by those operators that appear in the naive transcription of the corresponding classical quantity. There can be no objection, at least in the loop representation to the insertion of such operators, but it makes the constructions highly non-trivial[16]. As a result it is far from clear what real advantage comes from taking seriously the program of deriving the quantum theory from the classical theory, especially as the quantum theory is believed in reality to be the exact description, while the classical description should be only an approximation. It is as if one tried to derive Newtonian

[15] In the canonical formalism a hamiltonian is obtained whenever the time part of the gauge invariance is fixed.

[16] In the connection representation [] the situation is not as good because the additional operator dependence needed cannot be expressed in terms of the basic operators involving the connection (and not the loops directly) without additional operator products which themselves need regularization. So it is not clear that an honest point split regularization can be achieved in the connection representation; one may then have no resort but to invent a category of "state dependent" regularization procedures. This problem does not occur in the loop representation because there one can construct completely well defined local operators that measure the support of the loop directly, such as $\hat{\dot{\gamma}}^a(x)|\gamma>\equiv \int ds \dot{\gamma}^a(s)\delta^3(\gamma(s),x)|\gamma>$.

mechanics by a systematic procedure from Ptolemy's astronomy.

Yet another problem is that all forms of the Hamiltonian constraint so far developed have a problem with the continuum limit, in that the physical degrees of freedom are too localized in finite regions of networks, and do not propagate in a way that can lead to long range correlations in a continuum limit[66].

The last reason to take the spin network description as more fundamental than the classical connections is that $SU(2)$ spin networks immediately generalize to a large class of cases which furthermore, makes contact with conformal field theory, topological field theory and, through them, to string theory. Furthermore, the cases that make contact with conformal field theory are necessarily related to quantum groups which do not correspond in any exact sense to classical connections. I now turn to this story, which is another tale of how spin networks came into mathematics and physics.

5 Spin networks in topological quantum field theory and conformal field theory

Topological quantum field theory can be approached from three different directions, the purely combinatorial[7], the category theoretical[9, 14, 10] and through a path integral formulation of a quantum field theory[8]. Spin networks enter into all three of these. I will sketch briefly how each approach works with respect to the best studied example of a quantum field theory, which is Chern-Simons theory.

We begin with the path integral definition of quantum Chern-Simons theory[8], which is given by,

$$Z = \int d\mu(A) e^{\frac{\imath k}{4\pi} S^{CS}(A)}, \tag{12}$$

where $S = \int_\Sigma Tr(A \wedge dA + \frac{2}{3} A \wedge A \wedge A)$ is the Chern-Simons action on a compact three manifold Σ and A is a connection one form for a gauge group G. We note that the action S is invariant under small gauge transformations but transforms under large gauge transformations as $S \rightarrow S' = S + 8\pi^2 n$, where n is an integral winding number. As a result, the coupling constant k must be an integer so that the theory is invariant under large gauge transformations.

At the formal level, the quantum field theory defined by 12 is diffeomorphism invariant. In fact, the theory can be defined so that this is the case,

although this has not been done, at least so far, by defining an honest diffeomorphism invariant measure $d\mu(A)$ in 12 with respect to which $expiS_{CS}$ is measurable[17]. Let me put this very interesting question to one side and simply describe the result.

As the theory is diffeomorphism invariant, the expectation values of products of local operators do not contain very much information. Instead, the theory becomes interesting if one studies the expectation values of non-local operators. For example, if one has a loop, γ, then one can compute

$$< T[\gamma] >\equiv K^k[\gamma] = \frac{1}{Z}\int d\mu(A) e^{\frac{k}{4\pi}S^{CS}(A)} T[\gamma, A] \tag{13}$$

By inspection $K^k[\gamma]$ must be a knot invariant, in fact, as Witten discovered in a justly celebrated work, it is equal to a very important invariant, which is the Kauffman bracket. This invariant associates to every knot a function of k. However, there is an important subtlety. The integral 13 has divergences, which require that the operator products in the definition of the Wilson loop be regularized. This is done by smearing the loop into a strip and then taking the limit in which the width of the strip is taken to zero. This introduces additional degrees of freedom associated with the winding of the strip. We describe this as saying that the Kauffman bracket is really an invariant of a "framed" loop, or strip.

In fact, one can use Chern-Simons theory to give an expectation value to any spin-network Γ. Given a spin network Γ, there is a gauge invariant functional of A_a associated to it, given by the continuum version of the procedure I described in section 3, called $T[\Gamma, A]$. One way to express this is just to write out the spin network as a sum of products of loops, as I described in section 2, and then $T[\Gamma, A]$ is the corresponding sum of products of Wilson loops.

One then computes

$$< T[\Gamma] >= K^k[\Gamma] = \frac{1}{Z}\int d\mu(A) e^{\frac{k}{4\pi}S^{CS}(A)} T[\Gamma, A] \tag{14}$$

This turns out to be almost, but not quite, an invariant of spin networks. To define it we must deal with the problem of framing just discussed. The integral 14, when regularized, as it must be, will give an invariant of framed spin networks. The problem is to do the regularization such that a consistent definition of a framed spin network results. It turns out that there is a

[17]Note that $expiS_{CS}$ is *not* measurable by the kinds of measures described in [47, 48].

very beautiful way to do this, which is called a quantum spin network[7]. These are a family of deformations of Penrose's spin networks, which are labeled by a deformation parameter q. In the case of Chern-Simons theory $q = e^{4\pi/(k+2)}$.

Quantum spin networks may be understood as built up from the representation theory of quantum groups, which are deformations of Lie algebras. Quantum groups are Hopf algebras, but they do not correspond to groups, thus the quantum spin networks are in the category of extensions of spin networks that do not correspond to gauge invariant states of classical connections. They differ from ordinary spin networks in several ways. First, they satisfy a modified set of recoupling identities, which define a set of *quantum* $6j$ symbols that depend on q. Second, the possible spins on the edges cannot be greater than $k+1$. Third, unlike Penrose's formula for the value of a spin network, their invariants can detect information about the imbedding of the network in the spatial manifold. Because they can detect twisting they are even chiral, invariants such as the Kauffman invariant can tell chiral knots from their mirror images.

In the limit $q \to 1$, which corresponds to the classical limit $k \to \infty$ of Chern-Simons theory, the Kauffman bracket $K^k[\Gamma]$ becomes proportional to the Penrose evaluation $P[\Gamma]$ [7].

The Kauffman bracket can in fact be defined combinatorially[7], independently of the quantum field theory defined by 14. Thus, while there is no measure by which 14 is known to be defined, all expectation values of the form 14 can be computed in closed form.

Besides the path integral and the combinatorial approaches, there is a third framework within which Chern-Simons theory may be understood. This is the axiomatic, or category theoretic approach initiated by Segal[67] and Atiyah[68]. This approach begins by choosing an arbitrary closed two surface S in the spatial manifold Σ that splits it into two halves, each with boundary S. For a given evaluation 14, S has on it a number of "punctures", which are the points where the edges of Γ intersect S. The punctures are labeled by spins, j, which are the labels of the corresponding edges.

To each closed surface S, with labeled punctures j_α, one then associates a finite dimensional Hilbert space, $\mathcal{H}_{S,j_\alpha}$. This may be constructed through the canonical quantization of the Chern-Simons theory, but it may also be constructed combinatorially. One then constructs a topological quantum field theory for the manifold Σ, not by constructing one Hilbert space but by constructing a whole family of related Hilbert spaces, one for each punctured, labeled surface S that splits Σ into two parts.

The content of a topological field theory is in relationships that are defined between these Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_{S,j_\alpha}$. The theory has to do with topology because these relationships correspond to basic topological operations. For example, the operation of reversal of orientation of S is associated to the hermitian conjugate in $\mathcal{H}_{S,j_\alpha}$. Then suppose one has a cobordism $\mathcal{C} = \{\rho, \Gamma\}$ between two punctured, labeled surfaces, S, j_α and S', j'_α. This consists of a three manifold ρ with boundary $\partial\rho = S \cup S'$ together with an embedded spin network Γ that meets the boundary at the punctures, such that the labels agree. Then to $\mathcal{C}$ there corresponds a linear map

$$\mathcal{M}_\mathcal{C} : \mathcal{H}_{S,j_\alpha} \to \mathcal{H}_{S',j'_\alpha} \tag{15}$$

In particular, suppose one boundary is trivial, so that $\partial\rho = S$. Then the pair ρ, Γ must induce a state

$$|\rho, \Gamma > \in \mathcal{H}_{S,j_\alpha} \tag{16}$$

This is actually very much like Penrose's original notion, in which states are associated with open spin networks. However, these are more subtle, as the phase of the state depends on the fact that the open edges end on a compact two dimensional surface. In fact, the framing dependence of the quantum spin networks implies that large diffeomorphisms of the two surface can change the phase of the state.

One then constructs invariants of imbedings of (quantum) spin networks in compact three manifolds from the inner product of the topological quantum field theory. Given Γ imbedded in Σ, one splits them along any surface S, giving rise to two manifolds $\Sigma_{1,2}$ each with boundary S. In each half there is an embedded spin network $\Gamma_{1,2}$, each of which meets S at the same set of punctures j_α. One then has two states, which we may call $|1>$ and $|2>$ in $\mathcal{H}_{S,j_\alpha}$. The Kauffman bracket is then given by

$$K^k[\Sigma, \Gamma] = N < 1|2 > . \tag{17}$$

where N is a normalization factor, and I have included explicitly the dependence on the manifold topology. The identities of the topological quantum field theory then guarantee that this is independent of the way the surface S that splits Σ into two halves is chosen.

This is again a generalization of the notion of Penrose, as $K^k[\Sigma, \Gamma]$ is a deformation of Penrose's value $V[\Gamma]$. It is just that the newer notion is more powerful, as it can measure features of the topology of Σ and the imbedding.

But, in both cases, it is the recoupling identities from the representation theory that guarantee that the inner product is independent of how the surface S is drawn that splits a closed network and manifold into two open halves. It is this relationship between topology and representation theory that underlies the categorical approach to topological quantum field theory.

Another aspect of this construction is that it is related to conformal field theories. The Hilbert spaces $\mathcal{H}_{S,j_\alpha}$ are exactly the spaces of conformal blocks of conformal field theories defined on S [8, 10, 13]. This circumstance reflects a deep mathematical relationship between the representation theory of a quantum groups G_q at roots of unity and the representation theory of the corresponding loop group $\hat{G}$ at level k[12, 13, 69].

6 Spin networks as a bridge between quantum gravity and conformal field theory

We have mentioned four different contexts in which spin networks or their more elegant cousins, quantum spin networks, appear: Penrose's original formulation of a discrete angular geometry, lattice gauge theory, non-perturbative quantum gravity and topological quantum field theory and conformal field theory. It may of course be that this is just a kind of coincidence with nothing deep attached to it; the fact that the group $SU(2)$ describes both spin and isospin is usually thought to be genuine coincidence. On the other hand, it is worth contemplating the possibility that rather than being a coincidence, this is a clue that spin networks, or something like them, are part of the proper language for describing the geometry of space and time at the Planck scale.

One reason for thinking this is that the Chern-Simons invariant plays a big role in quantum general relativity itself. The reason is that when the cosmological constant, Λ, is non-zero, there is an exact physical state of quantum general relativity given by[70]

$$\Psi_{CS}(A) = e^{\frac{k}{4\pi}S^{CS}(A)} \tag{18}$$

where k is related to the Newton's and cosmological constants by,

$$G^2\Lambda = \frac{6\pi}{k} \tag{19}$$

By 14 in the loop representation, this state is exactly given by the Kauffman bracket $K^k[\Gamma]$[71, 72]. Furthermore, this state has a good classical limit[73],

in the limit of large k or small Λ, which is De Sitter spacetime. In fact, this is the only of the exact states of quantum gravity that is known to have both an exact description in terms of spin networks and a good classical limit. The fact that it is related closely to topological quantum field theory and conformal field theory is unlikely to be coincidence.

But perhaps the best reason for thinking that spin networks might be fundamental for quantum geometry are that they are part of a cluster of mathematical structures that connect algebra, representation theory and topology. We have already seen the beginning of this at the end of the last section, but the relationship goes still deeper. The core of it is a set of deep relationships between the representation theories of various algebras and topological problems in various dimensions, which are beautifully expressed in the language of the theory of tensor categories[18, 19, 20, 21]. I believe it is very possible that it is there, in that locus of representation theory and topology, that the fundamental quantum structures that underlie spacetime are to be found.

If this is so then there should be contexts in which physical relationships can be found between structures found in quantum gravity and those in topological field theory and conformal field theory. To look for them, we may try to find contexts in which we can use structures from conformal field theory to solve some problem in quantum gravity. There are in fact two contexts in which exactly this can be done. In both of them we consider quantum gravity in a region of spacetime, M, surrounded by a boundary, $\partial M = S \times R$, on which a particular boundary condition has been imposed, which is

$$e^i = \frac{kG^2}{2\pi} f^i \tag{20}$$

where e^i is the pull back of the self-dual two form of the metric to the boundary and f^i is the pullback of the self-dual part of the curvature. These are called self-dual boundary conditions.

There are two interesting cases in which these boundary conditions may be realized. The first is in the case of Euclidean quantum gravity with a cosmological constant Λ, which are related by 19 [74]

The second, and perhaps more exciting case, is Minkowskian quantum gravity, where we require that the geometry of the boundary may be matched to a static spherical surface in the classical Schwarzchild solution of radius R, in which case[75]

$$k = \frac{A[S]}{2} \frac{R}{2M} = \frac{\pi R^3}{M} \tag{21}$$

where $A[S]$ is the area of the surface.

In each of these two cases there is an algebra of observables defined on the surface S, which we may call $\mathcal{A}_S$. What is very interesting is that as long as the boundary conditions are chosen so that k is an integer, a representation can be constructed for this algebra from direct sums of the finite dimensional Hilbert spaces $\mathcal{H}_{S,j_\alpha}$, which are the spaces of conformal blocks associated with Chern- Simons theory at level k. I will describe how this goes in the case of Euclidean quantum gravity[74], the story is similar for the Minkowskian black hole case[75].

Among $\mathcal{A}_S$ are observables $A[R]$ which measure the areas of every region R of S. The eigenspaces of these are associated with punctures on the surface, labeled by spins j_α. Each set of punctures and labels corresponds to areas

$$A[R] = \frac{l^2_{Planck}}{2} \sum_{\alpha \in R} \sqrt{j_\alpha (j_\alpha + 1)} \tag{22}$$

Associated to each set of punctures and representations are two state spaces $\mathcal{H}_{S,j_\alpha}$ from conformal field theory and $\mathcal{H}^{QG}_{S,j_\alpha}$, which is a subspace of the space of states of quantum gravity, $\mathcal{H}^{QG}_{S,j_\alpha}$ with cosmological constant 19 consisting of all (quantum) spin networks that enter the boundary at the punctures with edges given by the spins of the punctures. This is the diffeomorphism invariant subspace, in which we have applied the diffeomorphisms in the interior of the surface, but not yet the Hamiltonian constraint. What is very interesting is that there is a space of physical states of quantum gravity that lives inside each of these which is isomorphic to the space $\mathcal{H}_{S,j_\alpha}$. These states are related to the Chern-Simons state 18.

There are two remarkable things about these physical states of quantum gravity. The first is that all the operators in the surface algebra $\mathcal{A}_S$ of quantum gravity can be represented directly in terms of operators that either act within each space of conformal blocks or map between them. The second thing is that in the limit $k \to \infty$ the dimensionality of these state spaces saturate the Bekenstein bound[74],

$$Dim \mathcal{H}_{S,j_\alpha} = e^{c A_{S,j_\alpha}/l^2_{Planck}} \tag{23}$$

where A_{S,j_α} is the eigenvalue for the area of the surface coming from quantum gravity, and c is a dimensionless constant of order unity (which is not equal to $1/4$[18].)

[18] We do not expect to get the 1/4 right. Among other reasons, we expect there must

This formula is remarkable as it involves input from both conformal field theory and quantum gravity, and it supports a conjecture coming from black hole thermodynamics. In my opinion it is evidence for the existence of a non-trivial connection between these things.

Given that there are independent arguments for the Bekenstein bound, we may conjecture that these states are all the exact physical states in the theory with the boundary conditions 20. In this case we may write a formula for the physical state space of quantum gravity with the self-dual boundary conditions 20

$$\mathcal{H}_S^{physical} = \sum_{j_\alpha} \mathcal{H}_{S,j_\alpha} \tag{24}$$

expressing the physical state space of quantum gravity in $3+1$ dimensions as a direct sum of spaces of conformal blocks associated with Chern-Simons theory.

7 The dynamics of spin networks

The main result of non-perturbative quantum gravity so far is that the kinematics of the spacetime are described in terms of a basis of states which are in one to one correspondence with embeddings of spin networks. The next step is to study dynamics. Three approaches to the dynamics of quantum gravity are being studied which employ spin networks. The first is to express the Hamiltonian constraint as an operator on spin networks[22, 64, 56, 65]. The main technical problem here is to find a regularization and renormalization of the Hamiltonian constraint so that a space of solutions, which are exact physical states, may be constructed. There are several different approaches that have been pursued, the state of the art is presently represented by the recent papers of Thiemann[53, 54] and Borissov[65]. As I have already mentioned, there are several kinds of exact solutions known, which follow from different approaches to defining the quantum Hamiltonian constraint.

The second approach is to fix the time gauge, so that the dynamics is generated by a Hamiltonian rather than a Hamiltonian constraint. Several cases are under study, in which time is taken to be given by the value of a matter degree of freedom, such as a scalar field[76, 64, 65] or dust[77]. One may also try to employ an intrinsic notion of time such as that based on the

be a finite renormalization of Newton's constant between its bare, Planck scale value and the measured macroscopic value.

Chern-Simons invariant of the Ashtekar-Sen connection[73] or one derived from an abeleanization of the constraints[78].

The third approach is to write the time evolution operator directly by means of a path integral. In such a formulation, the continuous path integrals of the formal theory are replaced by sums over four dimensional spin networks, each of which represents a discrete spacetime geometry. Although this is the newest approach to dynamics, there are three approaches being pursued at the present time. The first is the effort to extend topological field theory from three to four dimensions[79]. The second is recent work of Reisenberger and Rovelli in which a time evolution operator for Euclidean quantum gravity is found[80]. There are very interesting similarities between the results of these two programs, which suggest either that quantum gravity will be a four dimensional topological quantum field theory, or will be closely related to it[19]

However, both of these formulations are Euclidean. One might prefer to construct a path integral for the Minkowskian signature theory directly. If this were possible one could implement the causal structure directly at the level of the four dimensional networks that provide the histories for spin networks. It turns out that exactly this can be accomplished, leading to a class of path integrals for the evolution of spin networks in Minkowskian time, in which amplitude is expressed in terms of a discrete structure that is both a four dimensional spin network and a causal set [84][20].

8 The future

We have seen that Penrose's original intuition has been confirmed: spin networks do provide a kinematical framework for understanding quantum geometry. At least they do if by quantum geometry we mean the quantization of Einstein's classical theory. However, there are many reasons to

[19]How could quantum gravity be a topological quantum field theory, if those theories have only finite numbers of degrees of freedom, associated with surfaces? The answer is the Bekenstein bound[81], which tells us that any subspace of the state space of quantum gravity associated with measurements made in a bounded region with finite surface area must be finite. The holographic hypothesis of 'tHooft[82] and Susskind[83] then conjectures that such a theory is defined in terms of state spaces and observables on surfaces. As far as I know, the only consistent non-perturbative quantum field theories that realize the holographic hypothesis are topological quantum field theories.

[20]That is a graph on which there are a set of causal relations such as one finds amongst points in Minkowskian spacetime as in [85].

believe that in reality quantum geometry is a good deal subtler than that. Among these are,

- There are other degrees of freedom besides the spacetime metric, and we wonder if it might be possible to understand them in some framework that unifies them with geometry. Certainly string theory provides evidence from the perturbative level that this should be possible.

- In any quantum theory of gravity based on some discrete framework that has critical behavior, leading to a classical limit in which the universe grows very large in Planck units, the effective action that governs the large scale dynamics of spacetime should be, to good approximation, described by general relativity. (This is an old argument, based on the usual renormalization group considerations.) Thus, there is no reason to suppose that the microscopic dynamics has anything to do with general relativity. Instead, the problem is to show that the theory does have critical behavior necessary for the discrete universes it describes to grow big and classical.

- There are a number of problems that we have no idea how to solve given the ideas and structures we now have, which include the problem of the smallness of the cosmological constant, the other problems of the specialness of the parameters of low energy physics and cosmology, the black hole information puzzle, as well as the interpretational problems of quantum cosmology. The solutions to these problems might very well require new mathematical structures, we should thus be looking for them.

I would then like to close with a list of conjectures about what spin networks might have to do with a form of quantum gravity that would address these issues.

- There is a quantum theory X, defined in a purely algebraic fashion, without respect to any background manifold or geometry, which has as a classical limit $3+1$ general relativity coupled to certain matter fields.

- The perturbative theory around the classical limit of theory X is described by some perturbative string theory.

- The kinematical structure of X is defined from the representation theory of some Hopf algebra, associated with the groups which play special roles in perturbative string theory, such as $SO(8)$ and the exceptional groups. The natural language for theory X will then be that of tensor categories. As such, a generalization of spin networks, such as one finds in category theory[18, 19, 21] will play a role in the theory.

- Theory X will realize directly the holographic hypothesis and the Bekenstein bound, because it will be interpretable in terms of state spaces and observable algebras associated with boundaries that divide the universe into parts, following the categorical framework for topological quantum field theory. Thus, it will resolve the interpretational problems of quantum cosmology along the lines of the proposals of Crane[86], Rovelli[87] and the author[88, 89].

- Geometry will arise from theory X when a system has a critical behavior, as in the case of random surface theory and models of quantum gravity based on dynamical triangulation and Regge calculus. When they are so defined, operators that measure geometrical quantities will have discrete spectra, as in the case of areas and volumes in quantum general relativity. Further, there will be algebraic conditions required for the theory to be critical at the non-perturbative level, which will be related to the conditions that are required so that a conformal field theory may describe a perturbative string theory.

- As there is no agent external to the universe to tune some relevant coupling to make the system critical, the critical behavior of cosmologies defined by Theory X, necessary for the universe to get big and classical, must be the result of some mechanism of self-organized criticality. We may conjecture that self-organized critical behavior corresponds to Minkowskian signature quantum gravity in the same sense that equilibrium critical behavior corresponds to Euclidean quantum field theory.

This last point takes us beyond what has been mentioned here, the rational behind it is described in a companion paper[90]. The other points come from taking an optimistic stance, in which one assumes that the main robust results of the different approaches to quantum gravity are all true. Thus, rather than seeing string theory and non-perturbative quantum gravity as somehow opposing each other, I think it is more fruitful to believe that they

represent different regimes of the same fundamental theory. If this is true, we may be closer to that theory than we think.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

It is a pleasure to thank John Baez, Louis Crane, Ted Jacobson, Louis Kauffman, Carlo Rovelli, Roumen Borissov, Seth Major and, or course, Roger Penrose, for teaching me most of what I know about spin networks (as well as a great deal more that I forgot.) I am indebted also to Roumen Borissov, Kirill Krasnov and Fotini Markopoulou for many conversations about the future direction of this subject as well as for comments on a draft of this paper. I would also like to thank Nick Khuri and Daniel Amati for hospitality at The Rockefeller University and SISSA during the course of this work. This work was supported by the NSF grant PHY-93-96246 to The Pennsylvania State University.

References

[1] R. Penrose, *Theory of quantized directions* unpublished manuscript.

[2] R Penrose: in *Quantum theory and beyond* ed T Bastin, Cambridge U Press 1971; in *Advances in Twistor Theory*, ed. L. P. Hughston and R. S. Ward, (Pitman,1979) p. 301; in *Combinatorial Mathematics and its Application* (ed. D. J. A. Welsh) (Academic Press,1971).

[3] C. Rovelli and L. Smolin *Discreteness of area and volume in quantum gravity* Nuclear Physics B 442 (1995) 593. Erratum: Nucl. Phys. B 456 (1995) 734.

[4] C. Rovelli and L. Smolin, "Spin networks and quantum gravity" gr-qc/9505006, Physical Review

[5] J. Kogut and L. Susskind, Phys. Rev. D 11 (1975) 395.

[6] W. Furmanski and A. Kowala, Nucl. Phys. B 291 (1987) 594.

[7] L. Kauffman and S. Lins *Tempereley-Lieb Recoupling Theory and Invariants of 3-Manifolds* Princeton University Press, 1994, and references therein.

[8] E. Witten, *Quantum field theory and the Jones Polynomial* Commun. Math. Phys. 121 (1989) 351.

[9] V Turaev O Viro: Topology 31 (1992) 865

[10] L. Crane, Commun. Math. Phys. 135 (1991) 615; Phys. Lett. B 259 (1991) 243.

[11] E. Verlinde, *Fusion rules and modular transformations in 2D conformal field theory* Nucl. Phys. B 300 (1988) 360.

[12] G. Moore and N. Seiberg, *Classical and quantum conformal field theories* Comun. Math. Phys. 123 (1988) 177.

[13] G. Moore and N. Yu. Reshetikhin, *A comment on quantum group symmetry in conformal field theory*, Nucl. Phys. B 328 (1989) 557.

[14] N. Yu. Reshetikhin and V. G. Turaev, *Ribbon graphs and their invariants derived from quantum groups*, Commun. Math. Phys. 127 (1990) 1; *Invariants of 3-manifolds via link polynomials and quantum groups*, Invent. Math. 103 (1991) 547.

[15] S. Major and L. Smolin, *Quantum deformation of quantum gravity* gr-qc/9512020, Nucl. Phys. B 473 (1996) 267.

[16] R. Borissov, S. Major and L. Smolin, *The geometry of quantum spin networks* gr-qc/9512043, Class. and Quant. Grav. 12 (1996) 3183.

[17] J. Baez, *Spin network states in gauge theory*, gr-qc/941107, Adv. Math. (1995), to appear; *Spin networks in non-perturbative quantum gravity*, gr-qc/9504036.

[18] A. Joyal and R. Street, *Braided monoidal categories*, Macqurie Mathematics Reports, no. 860081 (1986); *The geometry of tensor calculus I*Adv. Math. 88 (1991) 55.

[19] D. N. Yetter, *Quantum groups and representations of monoidal categories*, Math. Proc. Cam. Phil. Soc. 108 (1990) 261.

[20] N. Yu. Reshetikhin, *Quasitriangular Hopf algebras and invariants of tangles*, Lenningrad Math. J. 1 (1990) 491.

[21] V. Chari and A. Pressley, *A guide to Quantum Groups*, Cambridge University Press, 1994. For the generalization of spin networks to moniodal categories, see Chapter 5.

[22] C Rovelli L Smolin: Phys Rev Lett 61 (1988) 1155; Nucl Phys B133, 80 (1990).

[23] L Smolin: in *Quantum Gravity and Cosmology*, eds J Pérez-Mercader *et al*, World Scientific, Singapore 1992.

[24] A. Sen, *On the existence of neutrino zero modes in vacuum spacetime* J. Math. Phys. 22 (1981) 1781; *Gravity as a spin system* Phys. Lett. B11 (1982) 89.

[25] A.A. Ashtekar, Phys. Rev. Lett. 57 (1986) 2244; Phys. Rev. D36 (1987) 1587

[26] A. Ashtekar, T. Jacobson and L. Smolin, Commun. Math. Phys. 115 (1988) 631.

[27] L. Mason and E. T. Newman, Commun. Math. Phys. 121 (1989) 659.

[28] T. Jacobson and L. Smolin, Phys. Lett. B196 (1987) 39; Class. Quan. Grav. 5 (1988) 583; J. Samuel, Pramana-J Phys. 28 (1987) L429.

[29] R. Capovillia, J. Dell and T. Jacobson, Phys. Rev. Lett. 63 (1989) 2325.

[30] A. Polyakov, Phys. Lett. 82B (1979) 247; Nucl. Phys. B 164 (1979) 171.

[31] Yu. M. Makenko and A.A. Migdal, Phys. Lett. 88B (1979) 135.

[32] L. Smolin, *Quantum gravity on a lattice* Nucl. Phys. B148 (1979) 333.

[33] K. G. Wilson, Phys. Rev. D 70 (1973) 2911.

[34] G. Parisi, Nucl. Phys. B100 (1975) 368; *On nonrenormalizable interactions* preprint IHES/P/76/148 (1976).

[35] S. Weinberg, *General Relativity: An Einstein Centenary Survey* in S. W. Hawking and W. Israel, Cambridge University Press, 1979. eds.

[36] L. Smolin *A fixed point for quantum gravity* Nucl. Phys. B208 (1982) 439.

[37] L. Crane and L. Smolin, *Renormalizability of general relativity on a background of spacetime foam*, Nucl. Phys. B267 (1986) 714; *Spacetime foam as a universal regulator*, Gen. Rel. and Grav. 17 (1985) 1209.

[38] P. Renteln and L. Smolin, Class. Quant. Grav. 6 (1989) 275.

[39] P. Renteln, Class. Quantum Grav. 7 (1990) 493-502.

[40] K. Ezawa, Mod. Phys. Lett. A11 (1996) 349; gr-qc/9510019; *Non-perturbative solutions for canonical quantum gravity: an overview*; gr-qc/9601050.

[41] R. Loll, Nucl. Phys. B444 (1995) 619; B460 (1996) 143

[42] H. Fort, J. Griego, R. Gambini, J. Pullin, *LATTICE KNOT THEORY AND QUANTUM GRAVITY IN THE LOOP REPRESENTATION.*, gr-qc/9608033; R. Gambini and J. Pullin, gr-qc/9603019

[43] T. Jacobson and L. Smolin, Nucl. Phys. B 299 (1988).

[44] H.B. Nielson, *DUAL STRINGS.* (Bohr Inst.). NBI-HE-74-15, Published in Scottish Summer School 1976:465.

[45] L. Smolin, in *New Perspectives in canonical gravity* by A. Ashtekar, with invited contributions, Bibliopolis, Naples, 1988.

[46] A. Ashtekar and C. J. Isham, Class and Quant Grav 9 (1992) 1069

[47] A Ashtekar J Lewandowski D Marlof J Mourãu T Thiemann: "Quantization of diffeomorphism invariant theories of connections with local degrees of freedom", gr-qc/9504018, JMP 36 (1995) 519.

[48] A. Ashtekar, in this volume.

[49] R. De Pietri, *On the relation between the connection and the loop representation of quantum gravity*, gr-qc/9605064.

[50] R Gambini A Trias: Phys Rev D23 , 553 (1981); Lett al Nuovo Cimento 38, 497 (1983); Phys Rev Lett 53, 2359 (1984); Nucl Phys B278, 436 (1986); R Gambini L Leal A Trias: Phys Rev D39 , 3127 (1989); R Gambini: Phys Lett B 255, 180 (1991)

[51] R. Loll, Phys. Rev. Lett.

[52] V. Husain, B313 (1989) 711.

[53] T. Thiemann, Quantum spin dynamics I, Harvard preprint (1996), gr-qc/9606089.

[54] T. Thiemann, Quantum spin dynamics II, Harvard preprint (1996), gr-qc/9606090.

[55] R. DePietri and C. Rovelli, *Geometry eigenvalues and scalar product from recoupling theory in loop quantum gravity*, gr-qc/9602023, Phys.Rev. D54 (1996) 2664; Simonetta Frittelli, Luis Lehner, Carlo Rovelli, *The complete spectrum of the area from recoupling theory in loop quantum gravity* gr-qc/9608043

[56] R. Borissov, Ph.D. thesis, Temple, (1996).

[57] T. Thiemann, *A length operator in canonical quantum gravity* Harvard preprint 1996, gr-qc/9606092

[58] T. Thiemann, *Closed formula for the matrix elements of the volume operator in canonical quantum gravity* Harvard preprint, 1996, gr-qc/9606091gr-qc/9601038 .

[59] A. Ashtekar and J. Lewandowski, "Quantum Geometry I: area operator" gr-qc/9602046.

[60] J. Lewandowski, "Volume and quantization" gr-qc/9602035.

[61] R. Borissov, R. de Pietro and C. Rovelli, preprint in preparation, (1997).

[62] N Grott C Rovelli: *Moduli space structure of knots with intersections*, J. Math. Phys. 37 (1996) 3014, gr-qc/9604010

[63] F. Markopoulou, personal communication.

[64] C Rovelli L Smolin: Phys Rev Lett 72 (1994) 446

[65] R. Borissov, *Graphical evolution of spin network states*, gr-qc/9605

[66] L. Smolin, *The classical limit and the form of the hamiltonian constraint in non-pertubative quantum gravity* CGPG preprint, gr-qc/9609034.

[67] G. Segal, *Conformal field theory* oxford preprint (1988).

[68] M. Atiyah, *Topological quantum field theory* Publ. Math. IHES 68 (1989) 175; *The Geometry and Physics of Knots*, Lezion Lincee (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge,1990).

[69] D. Kashdan and Lushtig, Harvard preprint.

[70] H. Kodama, Phys. Rev. D 42 (1990) 2548.

[71] B. Bruegmann, R. Gambini and J. Pullin, Phys. Rev. Lett. 68, 431 (1992); Gen. Rel. and Grav. 251 (1993).

[72] R. Gambini and J. Pullin, *Loops, knots, gauge theories and quantum gravity* Cambridge University Press, 1996.

[73] L. Smolin and C. Soo, *The Chern-Simons invariant as the natural time variable for classical and quantum gravity* Nucl. Phys. B 327 (1995) 205.

[74] L. Smolin, *Linking topological quantum field theory and nonperturbative quantum gravity* gr-qc/9505028, J. Math. Phys. 36 (1995) 6417.

[75] K. V. Krasnov, *On statistical mechanics of Schwarzchild black holes.*

[76] L. Smolin, *Time, measurement and information loss in quantum cosmology* in *Directions in general relativity, volume 2: Papers in honor of Dieter Brill*, edited by B. L. Hu and T. A. Jacobson, Cambridge University Press, 1993.

[77] D. Brown and K. V. Kuchar, Phys.Rev. D51 (1995) 5600, gr-qc/9409001.

[78] F. Markopoulou, Class.Quant.Grav. 13 (1996) 2577, gr-qc/9601038.

[79] L. Crane and D. Yetter, *On algebraic structures implicit in topological quantum field theories*, Kansas preprint, (1994); in *Quantum Topology* (World Scientific, 1993) p. 120; L. Crane and I. B. Frenkel, J. Math. Phys. 35 (1994) 5136-54;

[80] M. Reisenberger and C. Rovelli, *"Sum over Surfaces" form of Loop Quantum Gravity*, gr-qc/9612035.

[81] J. D. Bekenstein, Lett. Nuovo Cim 11 (1974) 467.

[82] G. 'tHooft, *Dimensional reduction in quantum gravity* gr-qc/9310006.

[83] L. Susskind, *The world as a hologram*, hep-th/9409089, J. Math. Phys. (1995) ; *Strings, black holes and Lorentz contractions* hep-th/9308139; Phys. Rev. Lett. 71 (1993) 2367; Phys. Rev. D 49 (1994) 6606; D 50 (1994) 2700; L. Susskind and P. Griffin, *Partons and black holes* hep-th/9410306;

[84] F. Markopoulou and L. Smolin *Causal evolution of spin networks* gr-qc/9702025. CGPG preprint (1997).

[85] L. Bombelli, J. Lee, D. Meyer and R. D. Sorkin, *Spacetime as a causal set* Phys. Rev. Lett. 59 (1987) 521.

[86] L. Crane, *Clocks and categories: Is quantum gravity algebraic?* J. Math. Phys. 36 (1995) 6180 in J. Math. Phys. (1996); *Is quantum gravity algebraic?* in Knot Theory and Quantum Gravity, ed. J. Baez (Oxford University Press, Oxford).

[87] C. Rovelli *Relational quantum mechanics*, quant-ph/9609002.

[88] L. Smolin, *The Bekenstein bound, topological quantum field theory and pluralistic quantum cosmology*, gr-qc/9508064.

[89] L. Smolin, *The Life of the Cosmos*, Oxford University Press (New York) and Weidenfeld (London) 1977, Part 5.

[90] L. Smolin, *Problems of origins in theoretical physics*, CGPG preprint (1997).